



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Tle

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,109	05/14/2001	La Tondra Murray	RSW9-2000-0147-US1	8729
7590	05/03/2006		EXAMINER	
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire Synnestvedt & Lechner 2600 Aramark Tower 1101 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950			PITARO, RYAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/855,109	MURRAY, LA TONDRA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan F. Pitaro	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment C, filed 2/06/2006.
2. Claims 1,3-11,13 are pending in this application. Claims 1,9,11,13 are independent claims. This action is Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1,3-5,9,10,11,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishisaki ("Ishisaki", US# 6,938,216).

As per independent claim 1, Ishisaki teaches an improved graphical user interface (GUI) having a GUI selection box capable of displaying a selection set of items when a selection menu option is manipulated in a first manner, the improvement comprising: a hot list box displaying a subset of items from said selection set of items when said selection button is manipulated in a second manner (Column 5 lines 3-34),

wherein the items to be included in said subset of items are manually selectable by a user of said GUI (Column 9 lines 41-65).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Ishisaki teaches an improved GUI, wherein said subset of items displayed in said hot list is displayed in an order selectable by the user (Column 9 lines 57-60).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, Ishisaki further teaches an improved GUI as set forth in claim 1, wherein a quantity of items displayed in said hot list box is selectable by the user (Column 9 lines 55-57).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 2, Ishisaki further teaches an improved GUI as set forth in claim 1, wherein a method of determining which of said items from said selection set are to be displayed in said hot list is selectable by the user (Column 9 lines 55-57).

As per claim 9, Ishisaki teaches a method of providing a computer graphical user interface, utilizing a screen interface and a pointing device controlling a pointer, to perform a plurality of related functions, comprising: selecting a selection box through the appropriate positioning and manipulation of the pointer by way of said pointing device, said selection box configured to display a selection set of items (Column 5 lines 35-54); selecting a hot list box through the appropriate positioning and manipulation of said pointer with respect to said selection box, said hot list box configured to display a subset of the items displayable in said selection set, wherein the items to be included in said subset of items are manually selectable by a user said GUI (Column 9 lines 41-65); and

selecting at least one of said items from said subset using said pointing device (Column 5 lines 1-2).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Ishisaki teaches the method wherein said hot list box is selected by right-clicking a button on said selection box using said pointing device (Column 7 lines 10-33).

Independent claims 11 and 13 are similar in scope to claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishisaki ("Ishisaki", US# 6,938,216) in view of Arcuri et al ("Arcuri", US# 6,121,968).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Ishisaki fails to distinctly point out determining most recently, or most frequent items. However, Arcuri teaches an improved GUI as set forth in claim 5, wherein said method of determining which of said items from said selection set are to be displayed in said hot list comprises listing the most recently selected items (Arcuri, col. 7, lines 39-51). Therefore it would have been

obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the most recently selected items of Arcuri with the method of Ishisaki. Motivation to do so would have been to enable a reduction of the overall movement of the input device as suggested by Ishisaki.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 5, Ishisaki-Arcuri further teaches an improved GUI as set forth in claim 5, wherein said method of determining which of said items from said selection set are to be displayed in said hot list comprises listing the frequently selected items (Arcuri, col. 8, lines 67-75).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 5, Ishisaki-Arcuri further teaches an improved GUI as set forth in claim 5, wherein said method of determining which of said items from said selection set are to be displayed in said hot list is applied to said hot list only after a predetermined number of items are to be displayed in said hot list (Arcuri, col. 7, lines 33-38).

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that Ishisaki fails to distinctly point out manually selecting which items are included in the pop-up menu box citing that the teaching is not present in Ishisaki. However the rejection of claim 9 had a typographical error which may be the cause for this question. The examiner clearly points out in the rejection of claim 1 the limitation of manually adding items to the menu is met by Column 9 lines 41-65. This same limitation occurs in claims 9,11, and 13.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100